UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,296	11/26/2003	Shinya Wada	SCEP 20.746 (100809-00226	5553
26304 KATTEN MU(	7590 09/07/2007 CHIN ROSENMAN LLP		EXAMINER	
575 MADISON AVENUE			BEMBEN, RICHARD M	
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/723,296	WADA, SHINYA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Richard M. Bemben	2622				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuenty and the set of the set of the set of the mail that the set of the set	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT bute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION.  The ply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	November 2003.	·				
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed.  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a constant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the sheet o	ccepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand ection is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prince application from the International Bure.  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Apiority documents have been read (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application _				

## DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - 1. Claims 1-6, drawn to a support device for a camera, classified in class 348, subclass 373.
  - II. Claims 7-22, drawn to an image processing method and apparatus, classified in class 348, subclass 50.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are directed to related stereoscopic imaging. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed (1) have different design, mode of operation, function and effect, (2) are mutually exclusive, and (3) are not obvious variants. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their

Art Unit: 2622

recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. A telephone call was made to Samson Helfgott (Reg. No. 23072) on 28 August 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,296

Art Unit: 2622

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard M. Bemben whose telephone number is (571) 272-7634. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RMB 8/28/07 LIN YE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER